

Appln No. 09/745,627

Amdt date February 6, 2004

Reply to Office action of October 6, 2003

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-26 were pending in the application. In the Office action mailed October 6, 2003 all of the pending claims were rejected. Applicant thanks the Examiner for attention to the application.

Claims 14-20 and 22-26 are now cancelled. Claims 1-13 and 21 are amended. Claim 27 is new. The remaining independent claims are claims 1 and 21 and the claims remaining in the application are claims 1-13, 21, and 27.

Independent claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,102,406 (Miles et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,224,486 (Walker et al.).

The Office action indicates that "the disclosure of miles that constrains can be placed on the game in terms of its duration is motivation to combine Miles with Walker where it is taught that it is well known to associate points based on a difference in time (2:18-30)." Office action, p. 2.

Walker indicates, in part, that "the player is given a limited amount of time to come up with an answer, and fewer points are awarded for a correct answer as time passes." Walker et al., 2:23-25. Walker et al. also states "players receive questions via e-mail and must submit their answers before a deadline, which is usually a day or two later. Points are awarded for each correct answer and deducted for each incorrect answer." Walker et al., 2:34-38.

Claim 1 as amended, however, specifies that "subtracting points associated with the user if the answer information does not match the predetermined answer key and increasing points

Appln No. 09/745,627

Amdt date February 6, 2004

Reply to Office action of October 6, 2003

associated with the user if the answer information matches the predetermined answer key; wherein the points subtracted if the answer information does not match the predetermined answer key is based on a difference between the answer time and the start time". Similarly, claim 21 specifies "deducting points based upon a difference between the answer information and the predetermined answer key; and measuring a time period delimited by when the clue information is provided and when the answer information is compared, such that the points granted or deducted is further based on the time period measured." Such is not disclosed or suggested by Walker et al. and/or Miles et al. Accordingly, claims 1 and 21 are believed to be allowable. Claims 2-13 and 27, all ultimately depending on claim 1, are also therefore believed to be allowable.

As the claims in the application are now believed to be allowable, allowance of same is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 

Daniel M. Cavanagh

Reg. No. 41,661

626/795-9900

DMC/rmw

RMW IRV1074213.1--02/6/04 2:27 PM